

traces being spaced from the other trace of the pair by up to a ball pitch, being maximized for identity in length and having up to one ball pitch difference in length and being maximized for parallelism and spacing. No such step is taught or even remotely suggested by Ohsawa either alone or in the combination as claimed..

The Office action states that the above step is shown in Fig. 3j of Ohsawa. However, a reading of the specification of Ohsawa nowhere teaches or even remotely suggests the claimed step. It is further noted that the Examiner specifically stated in the reasons for allowance in the parent application that "Lee et al. fail to teach each trace of each pair [of] traces being spaced apart from the other trace of the pair by up to a ball pitch, being maximized for identity in length and having up to one ball pitch difference in length and being maximized for parallelism and spacing". This is precisely the language used in claim 1.

Claims 2, 20 and 21 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over Ohsawa for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 1.

Claim 2 further limits claim 1 by requiring that each of the traces of the pair be further maximized for identity in cross-sectional geometry. No such feature is taught or suggested by Ohsawa either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 20 and 21 further limit claims 1 and 2 by requiring that the substrate be a printed wiring board substrate. No such combination is taught or suggested by Ohsawa.

Claims 3, 4, 22 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ohsawa under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 22 and 23 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over Ohsawa for at least the reasons set forth above as to claim 1.

In addition, claims 3 and 4 further limit claims 1 and 2 by requiring the step of applying a differential signal pair to at least one of a pair of the traces. No such combination is taught or suggested by Ohsawa.

Claims 22 and 23 further limit claims 3 and 4 by requiring that the substrate be a printed wiring board substrate. No such combination is taught or suggested by Ohsawa.

Claims 5 to 8 and 24 to 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsawa in view of Karnezos (U.S. 5,409,865). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 to 8 and 24 to 27 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over Ohsawa in view of Karnezos for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 1 since Karnezos fails to overcome the deficiencies in Ohsawa as noted above.

In addition, claims 5 to 8 further limit claims 1 to 4 by requiring the step of providing a further surface insulated from the surface, a plurality of the traces being disposed on the further surface. No such combination is taught or suggested by Ohsawa, Karnezos or any proper combination of these references.

Claims 24 to 27 further limit claims 5 to 8 by requiring that the substrate be a printed wiring board substrate. No such combination is taught or suggested by Ohsawa, Karnezos or any proper combination of these references.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Reg. No. 19906
(202) 639-7713